

## 2003 SMALL MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS (MS4s) ANNUAL REPORT – Due March 10, 2004

*By completing this annual report form, you are “providing the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) with a summary of your status of compliance with permit conditions, including an assessment of the appropriateness of your identified best management practices and progress towards achieving your identified measurable goals for each of the minimum control measures” as required by the MS4 Permit. Use of this form is not mandatory; however, you must address all the questions in similar format.*

**Name of MS4:** City of Rochester

**Contact Person:** Barb Huberty

**Telephone Number:** (507) 529-4907

**Address:** Rochester Public Works Department  
201 4<sup>th</sup> Street SE, Room 108  
Rochester, MN 55904

Permit Conditions	Yes	No
<b>1.</b> a. Did you hold a public meeting on your Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP)? [Part V.G.1.e] <i>NOTE: You must hold your public meeting before March 10, 2004.</i>	<b>To come</b>	
b. What was the date of the public meeting? <b>2/18/04.</b> c. In what newspaper or publication of general interest did you publish the public notice of your meeting? [Part V.G.1.e.2] <b>Rochester Post Bulletin.</b> d. On what date was it published? <b>1/16/04.</b> <i>NOTE: Please retain a copy of the public notice in your records.</i>		
<b>2.</b> a. During your public meeting, did you receive written and/or oral input on your SWPPP? [Part V.G.2.b.1-3] <i>NOTE: Input must be considered prior to submittal of your annual report.</i>	<b>To come</b>	
b. Did you create a record of comments and your response to comments/record of decision (ROD)?	<b>To come</b>	
c. Have you kept the ROD in accordance with the permit? [Part V.G.2.b]	<b>To come</b>	
d. Do you plan to incorporate any comments into your next SWPPP update? [Part V.G.2.c]	<b>To come</b>	

Permit Conditions	Yes	No
<b>3.</b> a. Did you identify and inspect <u>all</u> of your structural pollution control devices such as trap manholes, grit chambers, sumps, floatable skimmers and separators, etc.? [Part V.G.6.b.2]		<b>X</b>
b. How many structural pollution control devices do you have in your MS4 system? <b>0</b> . c. How many structural pollution control devices did you inspect? <b>0</b> . d. What percentage is this? <b>0%</b> . <i>NOTE: If less than 100 % were inspected, please explain why.</i> <b>We have no structural pollution control devices to inspect.</b>		
<b>4.</b> a. Did you repair, replace, or maintain any structural pollution control devices? <b>We have no structural pollution control devices to repair, replace or maintain.</b>		<b>X</b>
b. Briefly, summarize any significant unscheduled (not routine) maintenance or improvement activities stemming from inspections of your structural pollution control devices. Attach a separate sheet. <b>N/A</b>		
<b>5.</b> a. Did you identify and inspect at least 20% of your outfalls, sediment basins, and ponds? [Part V.G.6.b.3]	<b>X</b>	
b. How many outfalls and basins/ponds do you have? <b>~750 outfalls</b> <b>73 City basins/ponds completed as of 12/02</b> <b>19 City basins/ponds under construction during 2003</b> c. Indicate if this number known or estimated? <b>The number of outfalls is estimated; the number of ponds is known.</b> d. How many of you outfalls and basins/ponds did you inspect? <b>153 outfalls</b> <b>12 City basins/ponds (post-construction inspections)</b> <b>19 City ponds (construction inspections throughout 2003)</b> e. What percentage is this? ~20% of outfalls and 34% of ponds f. Briefly, summarize the dates of completion of major additional protection measures triggered by your inspections. [Part V.G.6.b.4]. Attach a separate sheet if necessary. <b>Outfalls are given a maintenance rank of: 0-emergency repair needed ASAP; 1-address as soon as possible within one year, 2-address as time allows but within 2 years, and 3-no action necessary. Of the outfalls inspected, there were no 0's or 1's, thirty-eight 2's, and one hundred and fifteen 3's. Maintenance on the outfalls will be completed by fall 2005. Two types of maintenance requests are made for basins/ponds: structural repair ASAP and sediment removal within 1 year. In 2003, no ponds required sediment removal, one had an emergency repair and one underwent a design change.</b>		

<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>a. Did you make a change to any identified best management practices or measurable goals that were submitted with your permit application? [Part V.G.6.b.1] See note below.</p>	<p><b>To Come</b></p>
---	---------------------------

Note: At this time, it is not necessary to revise your SWPPP to describe all operational and maintenance storm water activities you plan to undertake during the next reporting cycle. As you know, a May 2003 decision by the Minnesota Court of Appeals remanded portions of the MS4 general permit back to the MPCA for modification. MPCA has been working on changes to the permit. The MPCA intends to modify the permit in the spring, 2004. After the modified permit is approved by the MPCA Citizens' Board, MPCA staff will send a letter to MS4 permittees that addresses the process for SWPPP approval and the MPCA state-wide public notice for each MS4 SWPPP. Your revised SWPPP will be due approximately 90 days after the modified permit is issued.

Briefly list the best management practices using their unique identification numbers you used in your permit application or any measurable goals that were changed. Attach a separate sheet if necessary. **A summary list of BMPs, their measurable goals, and a completeness assessment is included in the attached spreadsheet. Changes to schedule and measurable goals will be added after the public input period.**

**7. Did you rely on any other entities to satisfy any portion of your SWPPP?**  
**Yes, provision of Hazardous Waste Management is an ongoing core function of the Olmsted County Solid Waste Division.**

**8. Do you discharge to waters with a restricted discharge? See Appendix C Part B; you may view the applicable rules at [www.pca.state.mn.us/water/water\\_mnrules.html](http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/water_mnrules.html)**  
**Yes, MnDNR has identified three calcareous fens ("fens"), which are classified as Outstanding Resource Value Waters, within Rochester. They are the High Forest fen, the Mutchler fen, and the Stonehedge fen. Only the High Forest fen is listed in the rules. The other two wetlands were confirmed as fens in 2003 and have not been added through the rulemaking process.**

If your answer is "yes," please attach the following:

- A map of the watersheds where your MS4 discharges to the waters with restricted discharge. (Use a USGS map or equivalent) **To Come.***
- A narrative estimate of the impervious surfaces where your MS4 discharges to the waters with restricted discharge (estimated total impervious from land use and zoning or existing data can be used if available).*

**Aerial photography (2003) was used to estimate the values presented in the table below for each minor watershed in which each fen is located.**

Fen Name	Watershed ID	Size of Watershed	Acres of Watershed Upgradient of Fen	Impervious Acres Upgradient of Fen	Land Use Upgradient of Fen
High Forest	wc-a3.2	810 acres	82 acres (12%)	8 acres (10%)	12 acres Airport (14.6%) 70 acres Agriculture (85.4%)
Stonehedge	hv-a1.11	243 acres	75 acres (31%)	9 acres (12%)	37 acres Undeveloped (51%) 14 acres Urban residential (19%) 24 acres Agriculture (32%)
Mutchler	wc-a.6.9	291 acres	169 acres (58%)	16 acres (10%)	83 acres Undeveloped (49%) 86 acres Urban residential (51%)

- c. *A narrative estimate of the future / projected impervious surfaces where your MS4 discharges to the waters with restricted discharge (using available zoning or planning information that may affect your future discharges).*

Fen Name	Watershed ID	Future Land Use Upgradient of Fen	Estimated Future Impervious Acres Upgradient of Fen
High Forest	wc-a3.2	12 acres Airport (14.6%) 70 acres Agriculture (85.4%)	8 acres (10%)
Stonehedge	hv-a1.11	35 acres Undeveloped (47%) 40 acres Urban residential (53%)	26 acres (35%)
Mutchler	wc-a.6.9	116 acres Urban residential (69%) 53 acres Open Space (31%)	26 acres (15%)

**HIGH FOREST FEN:** No future land use changes are anticipated in the upgradient portion of the watershed that could affect the High Forest fen. All the upgradient parcels are owned by the City. There are no runway or TH 63 expansions planned for this area. Since this area is within the flight path of the runway, no structures may be constructed, further limiting future development.

**STONEHEDGE FEN:** New development upgradient of the Stonehedge fen will consist of approximately 26 acres of residential lots increasing the percentage of impervious area at full build out from 12% to 35%. The developer of Stonehedge has a DNR-approved fen management plan that includes an appropriate storm water management approach along with natural resource preservation to protect the integrity of the fen. The fen and its wetland fringe will be preserved on a separate outlot. Storm water will be directed away from the fen into a treatment pond that will allow for post-treatment surface water discharge and infiltration downgradient of the fen. Additionally, DNR has approved a plan for upgradient infiltration of storm water to help sustain groundwater flows to the fen.

**MUTCHLER FEN:** It is expected that an additional 30 acres will be developed with residential lots, increasing the percent imperviousness at full build out from 10% to 15%. After full build out, almost 31% of the area upgradient of the Mutchler fen will be left as open space. The existing abutting subdivision has

atypically large lots for an urban subdivision and was designed with rural cross section roads to allow for greater than average storm water control within the boundaries of the subdivision. Runoff from larger storm events is captured in a storm water management pond that allows for water quality treatment prior to overland flow downgradient of the fen. Two residential subdivisions abutting the Mutchler fen are in the planning stages. The subdivision upgradient of the fen has a DNR-approved fen management plan that includes an integrated storm water management approach to protect the integrity of the fen. It will include on-lot detention with rain gardens, infiltration check dams, and storm water ponds. The second subdivision is the property on which the fen is located. There will be no development in the area of the fen or its wetland fringe. Discussions are currently underway with the DNR to determine if DNR wishes to designate this tract of open space as a Scientific and Natural Area.

- d. *A narrative estimate of how your SWPPP can be altered to eliminate new or expanded discharges to the waters with restricted discharge. This consists of your preliminary plan to avoid, divert, or eliminate discharges to restricted waters, whenever possible.*

Several existing processes allow for planning and design of residential subdivisions in a manner that is protective of fens. The General Development Plan review and approval process requires identification and delineation of wetlands (including fens) and must address the developer's plans to avoid, minimize, or mitigate negative wetland impacts, including selection of fen-appropriate storm water management approaches. In the cases of fens, mitigation is not an option and storm water management options must prevent direct discharge to the fen. Subsequent to the GDP submittal, review and approval of the site grading and drainage plan is required. This allows for the refinement of the overall development design, as necessary to meet the City's development and natural resource protection objectives. As final plats are approved by the City Council, the developer must enter into a Development Agreement with the City that outlines special obligations, such as the long-term fen monitoring and maintenance obligations. These processes are already included in the SWPPP and will not be modified.

The City, in cooperation with several partners including the DNR, will be submitting an LCMR grant application in 2/04 to create a fen probability map for the City's urban service areas. If accepted, this grant will enable early identification of fens so that the planning and design process can be more efficient and effective. Because the acceptance of this grant is beyond the City's control and is too large a project to be self-funded, it will not be added to the SWPPP.

If the LCMR grant is not funded, the City will re-evaluate the grant components to identify those that can be independently added to the 2005 SWPPP. Potential new BMPs could include development of a plan to proactively work with developers and decision makers to educate them about the importance of fens and the impact of development on them. Additionally, the City will consider the creation of outreach

materials for neighborhoods located upgradient of fens so individuals can implement fen-friendly lawn care practices. Finally, City staff can continue to promote state agency research and evaluation of alternative storm water management methods that are most suitable for fen protection in our geologic setting and which don't compromise groundwater protection goals.

### Owner or Operator Certification

The person with overall administrative responsibility for SWPPP implementation must sign the annual report. This person must be duly authorized and should be the person who signed the MS4 permit application or a successor.

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gathered and evaluated the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete (Minn. R. 7001.0070). I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment (Minn. R. 7001.0540).

### TO COME

Authorized Signature (This person must be duly authorized to sign the annual report for the MS4)

Date

Huberty	Barbara	Environmental and Regulatory Affairs Coordinator
Last Name	First Name	Title
Rochester Public Works Department; 201 4 <sup>th</sup> St. SE; Room 108		
Mailing Address		
Rochester	MN	55904
City	State	Zip Code
(507) 529-4907	bhuberty@ci.rochester.mn.us	
Telephone (include area code)	E-Mail Address	

Please submit your annual report by March 10, 2004 to:

MS4 Storm Water Program  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Road North  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194